



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT  
JODHPUR**

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13783/2021

Vipika D/o Shri Subhash Gehlot, Aged About 26 Years, Plot No. 8, Gali No. 5, Behind Rto Officer, Vishnu Nagar, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Rajasthan University Of Health Sciences, Jiapur, Jaipur Through Its Registrar.
2. Public Information Officer (Registrar), Rajasthan University Of Health Sciences, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Rajak Khan  
Mr. Sarwar Khan  
For Respondent(s) : Mr. Pukhraj Servi

**HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP SHAH**

**Judgment**

1. **Date of conclusion of arguments** : **18.02.2026**
2. **Date on which judgment was reserved** : **18.02.2026**
3. **Whether the full judgment or only the operative part is pronounced** : **Full Judgment**
4. **Date of pronouncement** : **06.03.2026**

**REPORTABLE**

**BY THE COURT (Per Hon'ble Shah, J) :**

1. By way of present writ petition, the petitioner has laid a challenge to the guidelines issued by the respondent University for applying for certified copies of the answer books under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as "the RTI Act")



and has also laid a challenge to the amended Ordinance notified by the respondent University in this regard on 06.09.2012.

2. Briefly stated the facts of the case are that the petitioner was pursuing her B.Sc. Nursing Course from the respondent University and as per her result for the final year, she had failed in two subjects i.e. (1) Midwifery Obstetrical Nursing and (2) Community Health Nursing-II.

3. Post declaration of the marks, the petitioner submitted an application for getting the certified copy of her answer books for the above subjects under the RTI Act and deposited the requisite fees.

4. In reply to the application so submitted, the respondent University vide its correspondence dated 02.02.2021 demanded a sum of Rs.1000/- (per answer-book) as processing fee as well as a sum of Rs. 80/- (Rs.2/- per page for 40 pages) alongwith postal charges of Rs.145/-. Thus a total sum of Rs.1225/- was demanded by the respondent University.

5. Being aggrieved against the same, the present writ petition has been filed alleging that the respondent University cannot charge the processing fess of Rs.1000/- as the same is in direct derogation to the provisions of the RTI Act and the rules framed thereunder.

6. The respondent University filed a reply to the writ petition and tried to justify the same while taking support from Section 7 of the RTI Act while asserting that as per Section 7, the respondent University is free to take charges i.e. further fee, representing the cost of providing the information. It has further been submitted that the charges have been duly decided in the





meeting of the Board of Management wherein initial processing charge of Rs.2,000 was reduced to Rs.1,000/- in the meeting dated 01.12.2014, which was approved on 20.12.2014.

7. The respondent University has further tried to justify the processing fee charges while referring to the circular dated 12.10.2018 issued by the State Government on the basis of the legal opinion obtained from the Law Department and emphasized that though under the RTI Act, charges are fixed however, under special Rules/Act, different charges can be imposed/taken.

8. The respondent University has thereafter further filed an affidavit asserting therein that for the purpose of undertaking the work of dissemination of information, the respondent University has appointed three persons on contract basis and based upon the salary paid to them, charges have been fixed, which is totally justifiable, as around 6.5 lacs answer-sheets are stored in the University, out of which every year around 350 applications are received seeking the certified copy of the answer-sheets. Thus, calculating the salary paid to the employees annually, being Rs.3.60 lacs being divided by number of copies, a sum of Rs.1,028/- arrives and therefore, the processing fee of Rs.1000/- is justified and does not call for any interference by this court.

9. Learned counsel for the petitioner placed reliance upon the judgment passed by Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***Alka Matoria Vs. Maharaja Ganga Singh University & Ors. (D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.12471/2012)***, decided on 21.12.2012 to emphasize that identical processing fee of Rs.1,000/- was being charged by the Maharaja Ganga Singh University wherein the same argument was raised with regard to





the fees being charged was in consonance with the expenses incurred for providing the information, still the Division Bench had set aside the Regulations wherein the condition of charging of Rs.1,000/- as processing fee was incorporated and had further directed that the fees cannot be charged more than the fee as contemplated under the RTI Act and the Rules framed thereunder.

10. Counsel for the petitioner further placed reliance upon Section 6 of the RTI Act to emphasize that the fees for filing an application has to be such as may be prescribed. He relied upon the Right to Information (Regulation of Fee and Cost) Rules, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as "the Rules of 2005") and emphasized that as per Rule 3 of the Rules of 2005, the application fee has been fixed at Rs.10/- and therefore, demanding Rs.1000/- as processing fee is illegal and in direct violation of the Rules of 2005.

11. He further asserted that by charging exorbitant amount of Rs.1,000/-, the respondent University has tried to make the provisions itself otiose and therefore, prayed for quashing of the guidelines in question.

12. On the other hand, counsel for the respondents while taking support from Section 7 of the RTI Act has tried to justified the fee being charged and further asserted that the fee is being charged in consonance with the expenditure incurred by the University and in consonance with the decision taken by the Board of Management.

13. Heard the counsel for the parties.





14. Prior to addressing the issue in hand, it will be first relevant to have a glimpse at the Statement of Objects as well as the Preamble of the RTI Act, which are re-produced as under :

### **STATEMENT OF OBJECTS AND REASONS :**

In order to ensure greater and more effective access to information, the Government resolved that the Freedom of Information Act, 2002 enacted by the Parliament needs to be made more progressive, participatory and meaningful. The National Advisory Council deliberated on the issue and suggested certain important changes to be incorporated in the existing Act to ensure smoother and greater access to information. The Government examined the suggestions made by the National Advisory Council and others and decided to make a number of changes in the law.

The important changes proposed to be incorporated, inter alia, include establishment of an appellate machinery with investigating powers to review decisions of the Public Information Officers; penal provisions for failure to provide information as per law; provisions to ensure maximum disclosure and minimum exemptions, consistent with the constitutional provisions, and effective mechanism for access to information and disclosure by authorities, etc. In view of significant changes proposed in the existing Act, the Government also decided to repeal the Freedom of Information Act, 2002. The proposed legislation will provide an effective framework for effectuating the right of information recognized under Article 19 of the Constitution of India.

The Bill seeks to achieve the above objects.”

### **PREAMBLE :**

“An Act to provide for setting out the practical regime of right to information for citizens to secure access to information under the control of Public authorities, in order to promote transparency and accountability in the working of every public authority, the constitution of a Central Information Commission and the State Information





Commissions and for matter connected therewith or incidental thereto.

WHEREAS the Constitution of India has established democratic Republic;

AND WHEREAS democracy requires an informed citizenry and transparency of information which are vital to its functioning and also to contain corruption and to hold Governments and their instrumentalities accountable to the governed;

AND WHEREAS revelation of information in actual practice is likely to conflict with other public interests including efficient operations of the Governments, optimum use of limited fiscal resources and the preservation of confidentiality of sensitive information;

AND WHEREAS it is necessary to harmonise these conflicting interests while preserving the paramountcy of the democratic ideal;

NOW, THEREFORE, it is expedient to provide for furnishing certain information to citizens who desire to have it.

BE it enacted by Parliament in the Fifty-sixth Year of the Republic of India as follows :-”

15. Furthermore, provisions of Sections 6 and 7 of the RTI Act will be relevant as far as the controversy involved in the present case is concerned. Sections 6 and 7 of the RTI Act are reproduced as under :-

**6. Request for obtaining information.—** (1) A person, who desires to obtain any information under this Act, shall make a request in writing or through electronic means in English or Hindi in the official language of the area in which the application is being made, accompanying such fee as may be prescribed, to—

(a) the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, of the concerned public authority;

(b) the Central Assistant Public Information Officer or State Assistant Public Information Officer, as the case may be,





specifying the particulars of the information sought by him or her :

Provided that where such request cannot be made in writing, the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, shall render all reasonable assistance to the person making the request orally to reduce the same in writing.

(2) An applicant making request for information shall not be required to give any reason for requesting the information or any other personal details except those that may be necessary for contacting him.

(3) Where an application is made to a public authority requesting for an information,—

(i) which is held by another public authority; or

(ii) the subject matter of which is more closely connected with the functions of another public authority,

the public authority, to which such application is made, shall transfer the application or such part of it as may be appropriate to that other public authority and inform the applicant immediately about such transfer:

Provided that the transfer of an application pursuant to this sub-section shall be made as soon as practicable but in no case later than five days from the date of receipt of the application.

**7. Disposal of request.—**(1) Subject to the proviso to sub-section (2) of Section 5 or the proviso to sub-section (3) of Section 6, the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, on receipt of a request under Section 6 shall, as expeditiously as possible, and in any case within thirty days of the receipt of the request, either provide the information on payment of such fee as may be prescribed or reject the request for any of the reasons specified in Sections 8 and 9:

Provided that where the information sought for concerns the life or liberty of a person, the same shall be provided within forty-eight hours of the receipt of the request.

(2) If the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, fails to give decision on the request for information within the period specified under sub-section (1), the Central Public





Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, shall be deemed to have refused the request.

(3) Where a decision is taken to provide the information on payment of any further fee representing the cost of providing the information, the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, shall send an intimation to the person making the request, giving—

(a) the details of further fees representing the cost of providing the information as determined by him, together with the calculations made to arrive at the amount in accordance with fee prescribed under sub-section (1), requesting him to deposit that fees, and the period intervening between the despatch of the said intimation and payment of fees shall be excluded for the purpose of calculating the period of thirty days referred to in that sub-section;

(b) information concerning his or her right with respect to review the decision as to the amount of fees charged or the form of access provided, including the particulars of the appellate authority, time-limit, process and any other forms.

(4) Where access to the record or a part thereof is required to be provided under this Act and the person to whom access is to be provided is sensorily disabled, the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, shall provide assistance to enable access to the information, including providing such assistance as may be appropriate for the inspection.

(5) Where access to information is to be provided in the printed or in any electronic format, the applicant shall, subject to the provisions of sub-section (6), pay such fee as may be prescribed:

Provided that the fee prescribed under sub-section (1) of Section 6 and sub-sections (1) and (5) of Section 7 shall be reasonable and no such fee shall be charged from the persons who are of below poverty line as may be determined by the appropriate Government.

(6) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (5), the person making request for the information shall be





provided the information free of charge where a public authority fails to comply with the time-limits specified in sub-section (1).

(7) Before taking any decision under sub-section (1), the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, shall take into consideration the representation made by a third party under Section 11.

(8) Where a request has been rejected under sub-section (1), the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, shall communicate to the person making the request,—

(i) the reasons for such rejection;

(ii) the period within which an appeal against such rejection may be preferred; and

(iii) the particulars of the appellate authority.

(9) An information shall ordinarily be provided in the form in which it is sought unless it would disproportionately divert the resources of the public authority or would be detrimental to the safety or preservation of the record in question.”

16. Section 22 of the RTI Act further gives an over-riding effect to the provisions of this Act, which is reproduced as under :

**“22. Act to have overriding effect.**—The provisions of this Act shall have effect notwithstanding anything inconsistent therewith contained in the Official Secrets Act, 1923 (19 of 1923), and any other law for the time being in force or in any instrument having effect by virtue of any law other than this Act.”

17. Section 27 of the RTI Act further bestows the powers upon the appropriate government to make rules to carry out the provisions of this Act. Sub-Section (2) of Section 27, more particularly clauses (b) and (c), give power to determine the fee. Relevant portion of Section 27 (2) (b) and (c) are reproduced hereunder :





**“27. Power to make rules by appropriate Government.—**(1) The Appropriate Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, make rules to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(2) In particular, and without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing power, such rules may provide for all or any of the following matters, namely:—

- (a) ... .. ;
- (b) the fee payable under sub-section (1) of Section 6;
- (c) the fee payable under sub-sections (1) and (5) of Section 7;

... ..

... ..”

18. While exercising the powers in consonance with Section 27 of the RTI Act, the Right to Information (Regulations of Fee and Cost) Rules, 2005 came to be framed. Rules 3 to 5 of the Rules of 2005 are reproduced hereunder :

**“3.** A request for obtaining information under sub-section (1) of Section 6 shall be accompanied by an application fee of Rupees Ten by way of cash against proper receipt or by demand draft or bankers cheque [or Indian Postal Order] payable to the Accounts Officer of the public authority.

**4.** For providing the information under sub-section (1) of Section 7, the fee shall be charged by way of cash against proper receipt or by demand draft or bankers cheque [or Indian Postal Order] payable to the Accounts Officer of the public authority at the following rates:—

(a) Rupees Two for each page (in A-4 or A-3 size paper) created or copied;

(b) actual charge or cost price of a copy in larger size paper;

(c) actual cost or price for samples or models; and

[(d) for inspection of records, no fee for the first hour; and a fee of Rupees Five for each subsequent hour (or fraction thereof).]





**5.** For providing the information under sub-section (5) of Section 7, the fee shall be charged by way of cash against proper receipt or by demand draft or bankers cheque [or Indian Postal Order] payable to the Accounts Officer of the public authority at the following rates:—

(a) for information provided in diskette or floppy Rupees Fifty per diskette or floppy; and

(b) for information provided in printed form at the price fixed for such publication or Rupees Two per page of photocopy for extracts from the publication.”

19. Subsequently, the Right to Information Rules, 2012 (hereinafter referred to as “the Rules of 2012”) have been promulgated while exercising the powers under Section 27 of the RTI Act. The Rules of 2012 were in supersession of the Rules of 2005 except in respect of things done or omitted to be done before such supersession. Rules 3 and 4 of the Rules of 2012 provide as under :

**“3. Application Fee.**—An application under sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the Act shall be accompanied by a fee of Rupees Ten and shall ordinarily not contain more than five hundred words, excluding Annexures, containing address of the Central Public Information Officer and that of the applicant:

Provided that no application shall be rejected only on the ground that it contains more than five hundred words.

**4. Fees for providing information.**—Fee for providing information under sub-section (4) of Section 4 and sub-sections (1) and (5) of Section 7 of the Act shall be charged at the following rates, namely—

(a) Rupees Two for each page in A-3 or smaller size paper;

(b) actual cost or price of a photocopy in large size paper;

(c) actual cost or price for samples or models;

(d) Rupees Fifty per diskette or floppy;





(e) price fixed for a publication or Rupees Two per page of photocopy for extracts from the publication;

(f) no fee for inspection of records for the first hour of inspection and a fee of Rupees 5 for each subsequent hour or fraction thereof; and

(g) so much of postal charge involved in supply of information that exceeds fifty rupees.”

20. A combined analysis of the RTI Act and the Rules of 2012 will clearly reveal that as far as the accompanying fee along with the application is concerned, special provision has been made under Section 6 of the RTI Act and corresponding provision with regard as to what shall be the application fee has clearly been provided under the Rules of 2005, which was later on repealed by the Rules of 2012.

21. Rule 3 of the Rules of 2012 fixes the cap of Rs.10/- being the application fee, which is to be accompanied along with the application. Thus as far as the provisions of the RTI Act and the Rules framed thereunder are concerned, there is a fixed amount, which has been determined by the Central Government in its wisdom for the purpose of filing of an application or for the purpose of processing application.

22. The other head under which the fee is charged has been specified under Section 7 of the RTI Act wherein the payment of further fee representing the cost of providing information has been dealt with. Sub-section (5) of Section 7 further provides that for information to be provided in printed or in electronic format, the fee can be prescribed, however, the fee so prescribed shall be reasonable in consonance with the provisions of Section 7.

23. Rule 4 of the Rules of 2012 specifies the fees for providing information wherein the “price fixed for a publication or rupees





two per page of photocopy” has been specified and rupees two for each page in A/3 or smaller size paper has been specified. Not only this, actual cost or price of a photocopy in larger size paper and other corresponding fee has been prescribed. It is, thus, clear that as far as the fee with regard to supplying of information in consonance with RTI Act is concerned, the field is already occupied by the Rules of 2012 wherein the fee has been specified even for the application and for providing information. This, coupled with the very objective of the RTI Act, makes it clear that the same has been enacted with the purpose of dissemination of the information to promote transparency and accountability in the working of every public authority and also with the purpose of combating corruption by way of providing information to the informed citizenry and transparency of the information, which has been treated to be vital for the survival of the democracy. It was with the above avowed purpose that the RTI Act has been enacted. Further, to give effective implementation to the provisions of the RTI Act, the Rules have been framed while specifying the fees.

24. Needless to emphasize that as far as the facts of the present case are concerned, a perusal of the guidelines so issued itself will reveal that the same pertains to providing of answer books under the provisions of the RTI Act itself and not under the Ordinance/Bye-laws/Regulations of the university concerned. Meaning thereby that all the application are to be filed under the RTI Act and the information is also provided thereunder. The guidelines itself refer to the provisions of the RTI Act. A perusal of Section 22 of the RTI Act will reveal that the RTI Act has been given an over-riding effect over any other law for the time being in





force or any instrument having any effect by virtue of any law. Thus, the provisions of the RTI Act will over-ride any provisions made in the Regulations/Guidelines of the University in so far as the application is being provided within the four corners and under the provisions of the RTI Act.

25. Needless to emphasize that the respondents themselves have admitted the applicability of the RTI Act and no separate regulations were framed by them for supplying the information, as demanded in the present case. Thus, the fee fixed by the respondents for processing of the application is ex-facie in conflict with the provisions of the RTI Act and the Rules framed thereunder and the same thus cannot be sustained.

26. It will be relevant to refer to certain judgments dealing with the provisions of the RTI Act. Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Institute of Chartered Accountants of India Vs. Shaunak H. Satya & Ors., reported in (2011) 8 SCC 781*** had an occasion to deal with the provisions of the RTI Act vis-a-vis the provisions of the Chartered Accountants Regulations, 1988. Hon'ble Apex Court while dealing with the entire case-laws, framed separate issues and also dealing with the object of the promulgation of the RTI Act held that the provisions of the RTI Act have to be given effect to and simply because many persons who are unsuccessful filing applications for seeking the copies for verification of the result, would not be a ground to deny the application under the RTI Act. Relevant Para 38 of the judgment aforesaid reads as under :

**"38.** Examining bodies like ICAI should change their old mindsets and tune them to the new regime of disclosure of





maximum information. Public authorities should realise that in an era of transparency, previous practices of unwarranted secrecy have no longer a place. Accountability and prevention of corruption is possible only through transparency. Attaining transparency no doubt would involve additional work with reference to maintaining records and furnishing information. Parliament has enacted the RTI Act providing access to information, after great debate and deliberations by the civil society and Parliament. In its wisdom, Parliament has chosen to exempt only certain categories of information from disclosure and certain organisations from the applicability of the Act. As the examining bodies have not been exempted, and as the examination processes of the examining bodies have not been exempted, the examining bodies will have to gear themselves to comply with the provisions of the RTI Act. Additional workload is not a defence. If there are practical insurmountable difficulties, it is open to the examining bodies to bring them to the notice of the Government for consideration so that any changes to the Act can be deliberated upon. Be that as it may.”

27. Identical observations were made by Hon’ble Apex Court in the case of **Central Board of Secondary Education & Anr. Vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay & Ors., reported in (2011) 8 SCC 497** wherein the Hon’ble Apex Court was dealing with the Regulations of the CBSE wherein there was an embargo for providing of the copies for revaluation and ancillary purpose. The Hon’ble Apex Court has held that the provisions of the RTI Act have over-riding effect and are to be granted full latitude and implementation. Relevant para 36 of the judgment is reproduced as under :

“**36.** Section 22 of the RTI Act provides that the provisions of the said Act will have effect, notwithstanding anything





inconsistent therewith contained in any other law for the time being in force. Therefore the provisions of the RTI Act will prevail over the provisions of the bye-laws/rules of the examining bodies in regard to examinations. As a result, unless the examining body is able to demonstrate that the answer books fall under the exempted category of information described in clause (e) of Section 8(1) of the RTI Act, the examining body will be bound to provide access to an examinee to inspect and take copies of his evaluated answer books, even if such inspection or taking copies is barred under the rules/bye-laws of the examining body governing the examinations. Therefore, the decision of this Court in *Maharashtra State Board* and the subsequent decisions following the same, will not affect or interfere with the right of the examinee seeking inspection of the answer books or taking certified copies thereof."

28. An issue arose before Hon'ble Apex Court with regard to the applicability of two different guidelines/Act for the purpose of re-examination/re-evaluation existing under the Company Secretaries Act, 1980 and corresponding right under the RTI Act. Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Institute of Companies Secretaries of India Vs. Paras Jain, reported in (2019) 16 SCC 790*** held that though there can be two different provisions providing for different fees, however, if the applications are to be filed under the RTI Act, then, the fees fixed under the RTI Act and Rules have to be paid and nothing beyond the same can be charged. Hon'ble Apex Court has held in para -12 as under :-

"12. Be that as it may, Guideline 3 of the appellant does not take away from Rule 4, the Right to Information (Regulation of Fee and Cost) Rules, 2005 which also entitles the candidates to seek inspection and certified copies of their answer scripts. In our opinion, the existence





of these two avenues is not mutually exclusive and it is up to the candidate to choose either of the routes. Thus, if a candidate seeks information under the provisions of the Right to Information Act, then payment has to be sought under the Rules therein, however, if the information is sought under the guidelines of the appellant, then the appellant is at liberty to charge the candidates as per its guidelines.”

29. Identical issue as has been raised in the present writ petition has been dealt with by the Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Alka Matoria** (supra) whereby the Division Bench while dealing with the provisions of the RTI Act and the Rules framed thereunder (at the relevant time, Rules of 2005 were in vogue) and also dealing with the similar arguments raised herein also with regard to the extra financial burden on the University, rejected the stand of the University and held that the charging of Rs.1,000/- as processing fee was illegal and quashed and set aside the Regulations of the University which provided for the same. Relevant extract of the judgment is reproduced hereunder for ready reference :-

“So far incurring of the extra expenditure by the University is concerned, the submissions have only been noted to be rejected. Any such vague reference to the alleged expenditure cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be the justification for the respondent-University to flout the requirements of the applicable statutory provisions; and the University cannot claim any special treatment than the other public authorities as regards the operation of the Act of 2005. So far the operation of the Act of 2005 is concerned, particularly as regards costs of providing information, such submissions on the part of the





respondent-University who is supposed to be an agency of the welfare State, appear to be rather illogical and unreasonable apart from being totally baseless.

Charging of fees of Rs.1,000/- for providing copy of answer-book, in the ultimate analysis, appears to be an ill-intended attempt on the part of the respondent-University to somehow discourage the students from seeking certified copies of their answer-books. Such strange regulations only demonstrate scant respect shown by the respondent-University to the cherished object of the Act of 2005 and the principles expounded by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Aditya Bandopadhyay's case (supra). The offending condition in the regulation is required to be quashed."

30. A collective analysis of the judgments passed on the issue in hand leaves no iota of doubt that charging of the processing fee of Rs.1,000/- by the respondent University cannot be justified and the same is rather in direct violation of the RTI Act and the Rules of 2012. When the Act and the Rules occupy the field, providing of the separate guidelines under the RTI Act which are in conflict with the provisions of the RTI Act and the Rules of 2012 inasmuch as charging fee of Rs.1,000/- for processing the application irrespective of the charge of Rs.10/- fixed under the Rules, is ex-facie arbitrary.

31. As an upshot of the above discussion, the writ petition is allowed. The guidelines dated 06.09.2012 as amended later on by way of the decision of the Board of Management dated 20.12.2014 (Annex.3 and 4) are quashed and set aside to the extent of charging processing fee of Rs.1,000/- per application. As regards processing charge, the respondent University shall be required to





provide the necessary information after charging the fee as contemplated under the Rules of 2012 and not beyond that.

**(SANDEEP SHAH),J**

**(DR. PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI),J**

ArunV/-, DR

